

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT
for the
Fiscal Year 2006-2008
STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM



October 2005

Public Review of Michigan's FY 2006-2008 State Transportation Improvement Program

Public involvement is one of the fundamental requirements of federal law governing transportation planning. The Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) allows for multiple opportunities for the public to express their views on transportation needs and services. These opportunities are specified in MDOT's *Public Involvement Plan* for Michigan's statewide transportation planning process, updated in August 2005. As stated in the introduction, "this public involvement plan provides direction for effective public involvement in the development of Michigan's transportation plans and programs. For our customers, this public involvement plan describes opportunities for involvement in determining the statewide focus and priorities for transportation investments in Michigan."

The process for public involvement for the FY 2006-2008 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) was presented in the FY 2006-2008 STIP report. The purpose of this document is to report on the public's review and comments on the preliminary STIP project list and the draft STIP report.

MDOT provided the public with a preview of a **preliminary list of projects** proposed for inclusion in the FY 2006-2008 STIP. On July 1, 2005, MDOT issued a press release (see Attachment A) announcing this information was available on MDOT's Web site at www.michigan.gov/stip for public comment through August 1, 2005. The press release was sent statewide to the Department's standard media list as well as minority media providers. A total of eight comments were received and addressed.

Prior to final approval of the FY 2006-2008 STIP by the federal agencies, a public review of this **draft report in its entirety** was conducted. On September 8, 2005 MDOT issued a press release (see Attachment B) to the same media providers announcing the availability of the draft report on MDOT's Web site for public comment through September 30, 2005. A total of five comments were received and addressed. This report provides all comments and MDOT's responses to them. MDOT will continue to accept and address comments as they are received.

On the STIP Web site for both the project list and draft report, MDOT provided an automated forwarding function to the staff who responded to the comments, as well as an automated reply to the sender. The Web site's auto response:

From: MDOT-STIP0406-Comments
To: [Customer]
Date: [Date received]
Subject: Re: [Customer's subject] Automatic Reply

Thank you for writing us concerning MDOT's Preliminary State Transportation Improvement Plan. Your comments have been forwarded to the team responsible for this document. Any questions you may have will be addressed by a team member shortly. Your input is important to the planning process. We appreciate you taking the time to review and comment on this preliminary plan.

On the next page is a summary of all comments and the responses provided by MDOT or a local agency as of October 31, 2005. The number in parentheses in the comment summary section refers to the comment number. A total of 13 comments were received, eight from the project list and five from the draft report. Two comments were regarding local roads and eight

comments related to transportation systems under state jurisdiction. The remaining three comments were requests for paper copies of the report or general suggestions.

STIP Public Comment Summary

Type	Comment	Response
Local Jurisdiction	Improve safety of F system by providing signs that meet MMUTCD standards. (2)	Do you mean county roads such as F-32 in Oscoda County?
Total: 2 Project list: 1 Draft report: 1	Resurface D-32 in Livingston & Washtenaw Counties. (13)	The Livingston Co. Road Commission responded that the Livingston Co. portion of D32 is scheduled for an overlay in 2006 or 2007, depending on funds and priorities.
State Jurisdiction	Improve M-60 between Vandalia & Three Rivers and M-62 between Kamp Kozy & Cassopolis. (3)	MDOT plans to resurface M-60 in 2008 and improve M-62 surface in 2006.
	Resurface US-10 and Business US-10. (4)	MDOT plans to resurface US-10BR/M-20 (the freeway portion) from US-10 westerly to Washington St. in 2006 and completely rebuild US-10 from just west of M-30 to the west Midland County line in 2008 and 2009.
	All plans (short & long range) for US-127 in Gratiot and Clinton counties. (5)	Mailed pertinent pages from the STIP, the Five Year Plan and the State Long Range Plan.
	Concerned that proposed passing relief lanes in Camp Daggett Road area will encourage speeding on US-31 between Shaw & Graham Roads where there are many intersections. (6)	There are two projects to improve safety: a 2006 project for passing relief lanes as well as center left turn lanes at Horton Bay and Camp Daggett Roads and a conceptual plan for a 2008 project to construct 3-5 lanes with a center turn lane in the Shaw to Graham area.
	US-131 north of Kalkaska needs repair in 2006 rather than 2007 when it's scheduled. (7)	Pavement conditions and funding availability were the primary factors in scheduling the work.
	Resurface or reconstruct I-69 from west Lapeer Co. line to M-24. (8)	Reconstruction for westbound I-69 is planned for 2009 and eastbound in 2010.
	Make Huron St./I-94 BL more non-motorized friendly, esp. at Crest and Chapin. (11)	An access management study is planned once funding is obtained. Resurfacing is also being considered.
Report Requests Total: 2 Project list: 0 Draft report: 2	Fix uneven pavement on westbound I-94 at the Scio Church Rd. bridge in Ann Arbor. (12)	MDOT plans to mill and resurface this section in 2007 (as a CPM project).
	One via USPS mail and one via a phone call. (9, 10)	Mailed one copy to each person requesting a copy.
Misc. Requests Total: 1 Project list: 1 Draft report: 0	Provide the region project lists on the Web site in one statewide list using alternative sorts. (1)	Provided three statewide lists: by route, by county and by year.

The following pages provide all the comments that MDOT received on the preliminary project list and the draft report along with the response to each one. They are presented in the order that they were received.

COMMENT 1 Subject: Sort Project List Several Ways

(From an internal customer) Can you have the list sorted by County, Year, Route? I think this would help show continuation of work along some routes year to year.

RESPONSE 1

Thank you for the input, [name]. We have the lists sorted by county within each Region but the secondary sort is the Job Number which isn't very useful for the public. I think your suggestion is a good idea and will look into revising the existing tables.

Customer's reply:

That's what I thought. The information being reviewed by the public was my concern. I thought about how the public may want to view it and thought the sort I suggested would be more helpful. I could also see it being helpful if you identify routes that cover more than one county. Therefore, you may be able to provide Review by Year and Review by Routes reports.
Thanks for looking into the change and responding so quickly.

Later response:

Excellent ideas. It shouldn't be hard to make those enhancements. I will ask my colleague for the originals and play around with various sorts. Thanks again for the suggestions.

I have attached four files using different sorts of the statewide rural project list. Do you think all four are useful? Should these sorts also/only be done at the Region level? Any other suggestions?

I will use the appropriate title for each sort as a link to each list (like transit).

I cleaned up some text and column headings and deleted the phase info since the entire list is A phase. I will ask Cory to remove the text referring to phases when he returns from vacation.

Customer's reply:

I think these are very good. I could see them all being used. As far as at the Region level, I might ask if this information is available to someone that may be interested as more than just a citizen (i.e. business, contractors, etc.) and if so is it common knowledge and accessible to them. If so, I wouldn't provide it at the Region level. I don't think citizens tend to think of themselves by MDOT Regions.

Thanks for making/proposing the changes. I hope it will be beneficial.

COMMENT 2 Subject: Safety, F System

Michigan's F- system, which, is used for trucking, needs an update, to ensure safe travel, to all that come to our great State.

I have traveled from shore to shore, on the F- system and found the signage not in compliance with the MMUTCD.

(Mio, MI)

RESPONSE 2

I received a copy of your recent e-mail and would like to ask you a question to see if I could be of further assistance.

When you say "F- system" are you referring to routes such as F-32 in Oscoda County?

If you have a copy of the state transportation map (it need not be the most current), you will see certain county routes identified with a solid, thick black line and a "marker" consisting of a box with the designation inside. F-32 is such a route which begins at M-65 in Alcona County and proceeds westerly through Oscoda County to M-33, and so on.

If this is the type of route to which you are referring, I could provide you with additional information. If not, could you tell me more information as to the "F- system"?

Thanks!

Susan Berquist, MDOT-Planning
berquists@michigan.gov
517-335-2929

COMMENT 3 Subject: M-60, West of Three Rivers

M60 between Vandalia and Three Rivers needs improvement. Also, M62 Between kamp kozy and entrance to Cassopolis is in great disaray.

RESPONSE 3

Dear Madam/Sir:

Thank you for taking the time to comment regarding MDOT's FY 2006-2008 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) draft project list. I would like to address the concerns you expressed in your comments.

We plan to resurface M-60 from the eastern limit of the Village of Vandalia eastward to US-131 in St. Joseph County in 2008.

In 2006, we plan to improve the road surface of M-62 between Kamp Kozy and Cassopolis using heavy maintenance funds.

I hope this information answers your concerns. If you have further questions, please contact me, and I will seek to address those concerns. Again, thank you for reviewing the draft project list for our FY 2006-2008 STIP and for taking the time to comment.

Sincerely yours,

Darrell Harden

Transportation Planner, Southwest Region
Michigan Department of Transportation
1501 E Kilgore Road, Kalamazoo, MI 49001
Phone - 269-337-3134; Fax - 269-337-3916

"Daring ideas are like chessmen moved forward; they may be beaten, but they may start a winning game." -- Goethe

COMMENT 4 Subject: US-10 and US-10 BR, Midland County

I am writing regarding the proposed resurfacing of US 10 and Business US10 in Midland County. Both of these roads are filled with potholes and uneven patches. I drive them quite frequently and would appreciate seeing them resurfaced. Thank you for considering these two projects.
(Coleman, MI)

RESPONSE 4

This is in response to your e-mail inquiry about MDOT's Five Year Program and whether there is any work scheduled for US-10 & US-10BR in Midland County.

In next years program (2006) MDOT will be doing a two coarse asphalt overlay to US-10BR/M-20 (the freeway portion) from US-10 westerly to Washington St. Included in that project will be some safety

improvements that will eliminate the east bound cross over lanes to Patrick St. (at west end of the freeway portion) where there have been a number of traffic crashes.

In 2008 and 2009 there will be work on US-10 freeway from just west of M-30 to the west Midland County line (12.4 miles). In 2008 the eastbound lanes will be rubbelized a new base established and paved with a bituminous surface. In 2009 the westbound lanes will receive the same treatment. All bridges will be worked on within this section as well. This will mean that traffic will be channeled to the side of the freeway that is not receiving work or that there will be a single lane of travel in each direction during construction.

I hope this provides you a clear answer to your questions, if not please feel free to contact me if there is anything else you have concerns about.

David Geiger, Transportation Planner
MDOT - Bay Region Office
55 E. Morley Drive
Saginaw, MI 48601
geigerd@michigan.gov
Phone: (989) 754-0878 E-228
Fax: (989) 754-8122

COMMENT 5 Subject: US-127, Gratiot and Clinton County

Caller requested all plans for US-127 in Gratiot and Clinton Cos. (3, 5 & 10 year) be sent to her. She was unable to open the pdf file (she thinks because of the type of service they have).

RESPONSE 5 Amy Lindstrom sent information requested and Region/TSC contacts.

COMMENT 6 Subject: US-31, Emmet County

Dear Sir or Madam,

Hello!

I read in the Monday Petoskey News Review that there are plans to construct passing lanes on U.S. 31 between Shaw and Graham roads. The article stated that the passing lanes would be constructed in the area of Camp Daggett Road. Is there a map showing the proposed project? How can I review a copy?

I believe it is #75455 and is located in Emmet County.

I am concerned that passing lanes in this section of U.S. 31 will encourage excessive speeds in an area with numerous intersections. While I agree that passing relief lanes are needed on U.S. 31 between Charlevoix and Petoskey, it seems there may be more appropriate areas for them to be constructed.

Thank you for your hard work and dedication to the safety of Michigan moterists.

RESPONSE 6

I have been asked to respond to your questions concerning road improvements in the Petoskey area.

I have not seen the article in the Petoskey News Review but the proposed passing lanes mention for the Shaw and Graham Roads area is not in the Camp Daggett Road area. These are two different projects.

What is being considered on US-31 in the Shaw to Graham Roads area is a multi lanes section, 3 or 5 lanes, with a center turn lanes to improve the safety. The project is being considered for 2008 and the plans are conceptual at this point.

The other project in the Camp Daggett area is also on US-31 between Horton Bay and Camp Daggett Roads. This is a 2006 project to built passing relief lanes between the two roads with the necessary approaches extending beyond them. The project will included center left turn lanes at both Horton Bay and Camp Daggett Roads. This section of US-31 was selected for the passing relief lanes because of the absences of wetlands and availability of existing right of way.

There was a meeting on this project to take input from the public. These comments were used in the design where possible, hence the center left turn lanes at Horton Bay and Camp Daggett. The access to the single commercial property in this segment of US-31 was also looked at.

This project will be combined with a larger resurfacing maintenance project from Camp Daggett to the Emmet County line.

If you have further questions feel free to contact me.
David Langhorst
Region Planner
(989) 731-5090

Customer's reply:

Hello David,

Thank you for responding to my inquiry. The proposal as you describe it mitigates some of my concerns with the inclusion of left turn lanes at Horton Bay and Camp Daggett roads. I am glad to see these relief lanes being planned and hope they will help address the problem with increased fatalities on our local roads.

Thank you,

COMMENT 7 Subject: US-131, North of Kalkaska

I realize that the August 1st deadline has passes but I would like to provide my input none the less. Reading your proposed list of MDOT projects I see that US 131 north of Kalkaska is scheduled for work in 2007. I drive this road every week and the north bound lane especially is in dire need of repair. I understand resources are always finite and tight but this particular project should be moved up to 2006 instead of 2007 because of the severity of the problem as it already exists.

Sincerely,

RESPONSE 7

I have been asked to respond to your STIP comment concerning the upcoming US-131 projects north of Kalkaska.

MDOT has taken a corridor approach to the reconstruction of US-131 with work being done north of Mancelona this year and a two year project for that portion of US-131 between Kalkaska and Antrim in 2006 and 2007. Pavement conditions and the availability of funding were the two primary factors in determining the schedule for the work. Design for the project will begin soon and be completed in 2006.

Preventive maintenance work has been preformed in the Kalkaska to Antrim segment to extend the life of the pavement till reconstruction can take place starting in 2007. Additional work will be considered, as needed, until the 2007 project starts.

At this point in time there is no practical way to advance the 2007/08 projects to 2006.

I hope this answers your question.
David Langhorst
Transportation Planner

Customer's reply:

Dear Mr. Langhorst,

Thank you for taking the time to respond to my email request regarding road construction on US131. With all of the projects your team is currently involved in, everyone must be working 23 hour days. Keep up the good work!

My wife and I really appreciate the quality of the driving surface of US 131 and don't mean to complain. I wasn't sure what was driving the timing and your explanation defines the process quite well.

Thanks again for your response and know that the taxpayers certainly appreciate all of the good and hard work that the people in Lansing produce.

Thanks,

COMMENT 8 Subject: I-69, Lapeer County

Dear MDOT:

I looked over the STIP plan, and I feel that I-69 between the Genesee County line and M-24 in Lapeer County needs some sort of reconstruction or resurfacing- especially on the Eastbound side.

Thanks for taking my comments into consideration.

RESPONSE 8

In response to your questions about I-69 in Lapeer County, we currently have this section of roadway planned for reconstruction. These projects will be going from M-15 to M-24, with Westbound being reconstructed in 2009 and Eastbound being reconstructed in 2010. Both of these projects should be identified in our upcoming Five Year Plan. If you have any other questions that you would like answered, please let me know.

Thanks,

Gregg Brunner, P.E.
Cost and Scheduling Engineer
MDOT Davison TSC
(810) 658-4029 Ext. 307

COMMENT 9 Subject: Request Copy of Draft STIP

RESPONSE 9 Amy Lindstrom mailed a copy to the requestor.

COMMENT 10 Subject: Request Copy of Draft STIP

RESPONSE 10 Amy Lindstrom mailed a copy to the requestor.

COMMENT 11**Subject: Huron Street, Ann Arbor**

This comment is intended as input on the State Improvement Plan for Michigan.

I am a resident of Ann Arbor, living just west of 7th Street, on Maple Ridge, Street, near West Park and the intersection of 7th and Huron Streets.

This spring, I lost my job and had to quickly throw cargo overboard, which included my car! For two months, my children and I rode bicycles various places and used the bus.

We often crossed Huron Street at Crest, and I was concerned about this! But I sensed that it was safer to cross Huron at Crest than at the busy intersections of 7th & Huron and Revena & Huron. I feel very strongly about that. The other intersections are designed in such a way that it is either unsafe for a pedestrian/cyclist, or very inconvenient.

In a recent conversation with the Transportation Engineer in Ann Arbor, I learned that Huron Street is a State road, and is under the jurisdiction of the State.

I would like to suggest that you carefully consider the difficulty people on bicycle and on foot have crossing Huron Street west of Main Street in Ann Arbor. This road is a major divider of residential areas in Ann Arbor.

There are just 3 controlled intersections -- (Ashley, 7th, Revena) -- from Main Street to Stadium Blvd. This is a very long stretch of roadway with residential neighborhoods on either side, and schools that

draw students from BOTH sides of Huron Street (north and south -- these are Slauson Middle School and Bach Elementary School).

I believe additional crossings are needed for pedestrians at Crest and at Chapin. This would make passage for pedestrians and cyclists in neighborhoods safer.

Consider the huge outlays for pedestrian and bicycle facilities that are of a recreational nature, and that do not reduce the dependence on automobiles. Then in that context, consider the potential benefit from improvements for pedestrians along this stretch of Huron Street. The residential neighborhoods are connected to shopping areas in the vicinity of Main Street and Kerrytown, and the residential streets provide comfortable routes for cyclists and pedestrians of all ages.

Thank you for your time.
Sincerely,

RESPONSE 11

Thank you for the comments you submitted as part of the State Transportation Improvement Plan regarding your concerns along Huron Street in Ann Arbor. Your comments have been recorded and noted.

The MDOT University Region is submitting a request for funding to hire a consultant to look at an access management study of Jackson Avenue, Huron Street and Washtenaw Avenue within the city of Ann Arbor. As a part of this study pedestrian and bicycle access issues will be addressed. Funding for this study will hopefully be obtained in 2006. For further information regarding this study you can contact Kari Andrewes, MDOT University Region Planner, at 517.750.0407 or andrewesk@michigan.gov.

To address your concerns, the MDOT Brighton Transportation Center (TSC) is recommending a resurfacing of Huron Street between I-94BL and Main Street as part of MDOT's 2011 Call for Projects. These projects have not been finalized and are being reviewed and prioritized along with 2 other projects in the Brighton TSC area by the Washtenaw Area Transportation Study (WATS). If this project

is selected for construction in 2011, the nonmotorized issues along this corridor will be looked at. The phone number for WATS is 734.994.3127.

Thank you again for submitting your comments.

Todd Kauffman
Transportation Planner
Michigan Department of Transportation
Phone: (517) 335.2938
Fax: (517) 373.9255
Email: kauffmant@michigan.gov

COMMENT 12 Subject: I-94, Ann Arbor

Did not see any inclusion of road projects for the WB lanes at the Scio Church Rd. bridge on I-94 in Ann Arbor. We have repeatedly called MDOT in Lansing to report major road uneven pavement in this area on a couple of occasions this summer. When heavy trucks go over this section of the pavement, it creates noise and ground transmitted vibration to the residences in this area for several hundred feet. The EB lanes were repaired this summer and this resulted in substantial improvement, but the WB lanes, which are directly behind residents' back yards, are in desperate need of repair.

Any idea when we might get a good fix on this side of the road, as the sound level and vibration that rattles things on the walls is becoming intolerable?

We have waited many times in recent years, as various parts of I-94 have been paved, repaved, and repaved; however, the section mentioned here was never been satisfactorily reconstructed.

RESPONSE 12

I would like to thank you for your input regarding the FY 2006-2008 MDOT State Transportation Improvement Program. Your concerns over pavement conditions on I-94 will be addressed. In 2007, MDOT proposes a mill and resurfacing of I-94 between M-14 and Carpenter which will improve ride quality and reduce noise. This project will use Capital Preventative Maintenance (CPM) funds. The CPM program is set up to address pavement needs, improve ride quality, and extend the life of the pavement without the great expense of a reconstruction project. I hope this information is useful to you. Please do not hesitate to call me if you have any further questions.

Paul Lott
Transportation Planner
MDOT-University Region
517-750-0405

COMMENT 13 Subject: Road Improvements for D32

Hello.

I hope this note is going to the appropriate person that can review my request. There is a road (D32 / Doyle) that runs from Pinckney through Hell and on to Gregory that is in serious need of repairs. This road may cross county lines – Livingston and Washtenaw, I believe. This road is a main route to get to Bruin Lake Campground in the Pinckney Recreation Area. Literally thousands of people need to travel this road with RVs and boats to use the state campground and boat launch. This road has been patched so many times that the surface of this paved road is worse than a gravel road. It is also somewhat narrow. When towing large vehicles through this area, many drivers will try to avoid the large bumps and end up crossing the center line in order to do so. This makes it very dangerous with the almost non-existent shoulders. This road also is traveled by many bicyclists and motorcyclists (Blessing of the Bikes in Hell). Our family / extended family use the Pinckney Rec Area almost on a weekly basis from April until the first week of October. We know firsthand how many people use and

enjoy this state park. We would really like to see D32 / Doyle resurfaced. Widening the road would also be very much appreciated. These improvements would eliminate potential safety issues and help to eliminate vehicle damage due to the excessive bumping while towing heavy boats and campers. Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Regards,

RESPONSE 13

Your message to the Michigan Dept of Transportation was forwarded to us for our response. I cannot speak for Washtenaw County but your message was sent to them as well.

Patterson Lake and Doyle roads (D-32) are tentatively scheduled for overlay in either the 06 season or the 07 season. Its current condition makes it a candidate for more extensive work than just an overlay. We are in the process of preparing our 2006 overlay program. The type of restoration best suited to employ and the available funds for the overlay program will determine its place in priority. With funds as tight as they are, our policy is to choose the repair that will get the longest fix for the least money. Boiled down, the comparison is do we spend \$70,000/mile on a repair that will give 3-5 years of acceptable service based on the existing surface condition, or wait and spend \$100,000/mile and get an acceptable product lasting 7-10 years. Candidate roadways are selected based on their surface condition and traffic volume along with route continuity.

A complete reconstruction is many years out unfortunately. To comply with current safety standards required in reconstruction the road would take a vastly different appearance and would require a great deal of right of way acquisition to lower hills and flatten horizontal curves. This type of work would bring construction costs nearing \$2,000,000 a mile.

If you have additional questions regarding the Livingston County portion of this route, I encourage you to call me directly at the number below or send email directly to us at mail@livingstonroads.org

Rick Little
Technical Services Supervisor
Livingston County Road Commission
3535 Grand Oaks Drive
Howell MI 48843
(517) 546-4250

The road segment the citizen is concerned about is in Livingston County. Please contact me if you need any additional information.

Roy Townsend
County Highway Engineer
Washtenaw County Road Commission

This concludes the public review and comment portion for the FY 2006-2008 STIP. The FY 2006-2008 STIP document, as well as the opportunity to comment on it, will continue to be available on MDOT's Web-site at www.michigan.gov/stip until the succeeding FY 2008-2010 STIP is approved by the federal government. MDOT will continue to accept and address comments as they are received.